

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902M) for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2012.

Application 10-12-005
(Filed December 15, 2010)

And Related Matter.

Application 10-12-006

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-05-010

Claimant: Center for Accessible Technology for itself and its predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates	For contribution to Decision 13-05-010
Claimed (\$): \$52,462.83	Awarded (\$): \$51,509.43 (reduced 1.8%)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: John S. Wong

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 13-05-010: This decision resolves the test year 2012 general rate cases for San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). ¹ The decision adopted a 2012 revenue requirement representing the reasonable costs of providing safe and reliable utility service to the customers of SDG&E and SoCalGas in that year, and also adopts post-test year increases for 2013, 2014 and 2015. The decision also adopted a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on accessibility issues.
--	--

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of Notice of Intent (NOI) to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	January 31, 2011	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI Filed:	Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA): March 2, 2011 Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT): September 22, 2011 (in conjunction with Motion for Party Status; (see comments below.)	Yes DisabRA's NOI was filed on March 1, 2011, not March 2, 2011 as stated by DisabRA.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	DisabRA: Application A.10-12-005 A.10-12-006 CforAT: No ruling of CforAT's NOI was issued in this proceeding. The	Yes Customer status reflected in the separate rulings dated November 1, 2011 in this proceeding for DisabRA and CforAT.

¹ SDG&E and SoCalGas are collectively referred to as the Sempra Utilities.

	Commission has most recently affirmed CforAT's customer status in Rulemaking R.13-03-008.	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	DisabRA: May 18, 2010 CforAT: June 14, 2013	Yes Separate rulings dated November 1, 2011 in this proceeding for DisabRA and CforAT.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-12-005/A.10-12-006	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 4, 2011	Yes Separate rulings on the significant financial hardship of DisabRA and CforAT issued on November 1, 2011, and not on November 4, 2011 as stated by claimants.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	Decision 13-15-010	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	May 14, 2013	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	July 15, 2013	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
			<p>As noted above, CforAT moved for party status on September 22, 2011 as the successor to DisabRA, and asked to adopt DisabRA's prior pleadings as its own. This motion was granted on October 21, 2011. CforAT's NOI was filed at the same time as its Motion for Party Status; until CforAT sought party status, it had no reason to file an NOI.</p> <p>Because CforAT is serving as the successor to DisabRA, as requested in its Motion for Party Status and granted in the ruling on the motion, this request for compensation refers to work performed by both organizations.</p>

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Claimant's description of its contribution to the final decisions (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).**

Contribution	Specific References to Claimant's Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. CforAT/DisabRA negotiated a bilateral settlement agreement with the Sempra Utilities to address issues of accessibility of the Sempra Utilities' services and facilities for its customers with disabilities. This agreement included provisions to follow up on a prior agreement regarding certain accessibility issues addressed in a settlement adopted in the Sempra Utilities' 2008 General Rate Case (GRC) (A.06-12-009/A.06-12-010) and added new issues concerning accessible communications. The agreement was found to be reasonable in light of the whole record and in the public interest, and it was adopted without modification.	D.13-05-010 at 21-24 (adopting the agreement without modification); <i>see also</i> Joint Motion for Adoption of Settlement, filed by the Sempra Utilities and CforAT on February 24, 2012, with the agreement attached as Exhibit A to the Joint Motion.	Yes
2. As permitted by the agreement reached between DisabRA and the Sempra Utilities in the Sempra	The Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) approved in D.13-05-010 specifically addresses intervenor status	Yes As noted in the <i>footnote</i> ,

<p>Utilities’ 2008 GRC and approved by the Commission in D.09-03-025,² this compensation request also includes time spent monitoring the implementation of the agreement in the prior GRC cycle, both prior to the filing of the 2012 GRC Application and while this proceeding has been pending. The work done to implement the prior agreement was necessary, and served as the basis for additional agreements in the current settlement.</p>	<p>and compensation, and states at Section VIII: “The Utilities agree that the issues resolved herein were properly raised by DisabRA and subsequently adopted by CforAT, and that DisabRA and CforAT as its successor have collectively made a substantial contribution to this Proceeding, as defined in the California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure. The Utilities agree that it is reasonable and appropriate for CforAT to receive intervenor compensation for certain tasks performed to implement the MOU, to the extent directed by the Commission.”</p> <p>This mirrors language of the prior MOU between the Sempra Utilities and DisabRA adopted in D.09-03-025, acknowledging the appropriateness of implementation and monitoring tasks following the adoption of that agreement, for which compensation is now being sought.</p>	<p>claimant’s reference to D.09-03-025 was meant to refer to D.08-07-046.</p>
---	--	---

B. Duplication of Effort (Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801.3(f) & 1802.5):

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)³ a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: While many other parties participated in the proceeding and a number of parties represented consumers (including vulnerable consumers), no other party addressed issues concerning disability access, which was the sole focus of CforAT/DisabRA’s		

² The claimants erroneously cite to D.09-03-025, which was the GRC decision for Southern California Edison Company (SCE). It appears that the claimants intended to refer to the settlement with the Sempra Utilities which was adopted in D.08-07-046.

³ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>role in the proceeding.</p>	
<p>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</p> <p>CforAT/DisabRA focused on the issue of disability access to the services and facilities offered by the Sempra Utilities, which was not addressed by any other party. Beyond this issue, CforAT/DisabRA only participated minimally, to the extent necessary to generally follow the procedural developments during the GRC process.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>We find that CforAT/DisabRA’s participation did not duplicate other parties’ efforts.</p>

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):

<p>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation:</p> <p>The only substantive issues addressed by CforAT/DisabRA were those focused on the unique needs of people with disabilities, including physical access to the Sempra Utilities’ services and facilities and communication access for disabled customers who cannot access information presented in standard formats. These issues were expressly found to be within the scope of the proceeding (<i>see</i> Scoping Memo, issued on 3/2/11, at 11) and built on an agreement reached in the prior GRC cycle.</p> <p>The separate agreement negotiated between the Sempra Utilities and CforAT (with initial work conducted by DisabRA) and adopted in the final decision was found to be in the public interest and was approved without modification. D.13-05-010 at 21-24. Prior to the agreement being finalized, CforAT supported its position through submission of expert testimony and other litigation activity in order to ensure that it could pursue its goals for improved accessibility at hearing if no settlement could be reached. These were appropriate actions as an active party to obtain benefits for the disabled consumers whose interests were at issue.</p> <p>CforAT/DisabRA also appropriately acted in accordance with the settlement reached during the prior GRC to oversee implementation of that agreement and obtain the benefits of that agreement for its constituency.</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p> <hr/> <p>Verified</p>
---	---

<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed</p> <p>The total amount of time claimed by CforAT/DisabRA is reasonable given the scope and length of this proceeding, and it represents CforAT/DisabRA’s focused attention on those limited issues where they were uniquely placed to address the needs of their constituency. First DisabRA, then CforAT appropriately monitored the implementation of the agreement reached in the Sempra Utilities’ 2008 GRC, and then engaged in reasonable litigation and settlement efforts to address ongoing accessibility issues, while also monitoring the complex proceeding. In keeping with the narrow focus on accessibility, the total amount of time spent on this effort remained constrained, notwithstanding the extensive overall scope and length of the proceeding.</p> <p>In its NOI, DisabRA estimated that it would spend 145 attorney hours as well as 25 paralegal hours working on the merits of this proceeding, including monitoring the implementation of the prior MOU. In fact, DisabRA and CforAT combined spent approximately 146 hours on the proceeding. This includes overseeing access improvements and securing ongoing commitments to Sempra Utilities’ customers with disabilities. These benefits will accrue to all disabled customers, but no individual customer would have had the resources to address access issues individually.</p> <p>In addition to the overall reasonableness of the claim, and the consistency with the NOI estimates, CforAT/DisabRA noted that their achievements were not impacted by the length of time it took for the overall GRC process to be completed. Despite the substantial activity in the proceeding after the negotiation of the settlement, CforAT/DisabRA spent only very modest amounts of time following the overall proceedings (including the proposed decision and comments), and did not make any substantive filings during that portion of the proceeding.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>The claimants’ estimate of “145 attorney hours as well as 25 paralegal hours” does not appear in, or correlate to, what was estimated in the NOIs of DisabRA and CforAT.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>In 2008 and 2009, all of the (very limited) time spent by DisabRA was spent overseeing the implementation of the MOU adopted in the 2008 GRC. This included 4.1 hours in 2008 (one entry of which is labeled “monitoring” rather than “implementation,” but which served the same function), and 3.7 hours in 2009. In 2010 and 2011, as work began on the 2012 GRC, the portion of time spent on implementation was reduced to 27% in 2010 and 24% in 2011, even as the total amount of time increased slightly to 10.7 hours and 7.1 hours, respectively.</p> <p>Overall, in 2010, DisabRA allocated its time as follows:</p>	<p>Verified</p>

- Implementation of the prior settlement, as noted above;
- 34% on General Participation
- 38% on Access;
- 1% on Settlement

Collectively, these activities total 35.4 of 39 total hours recorded as merits time by DisabRA in 2010. The remaining 3.6 hours were not broken into the identified issues, but were classified as “Merits.” However, these limited hours that are not directly categorized do not meaningfully change the overall breakdown.

In 2011, DisabRA (which had responsibility for the proceeding through the summer) allocated its time as follows:

- Implementation of the prior settlement, as noted above;
- 34% on General Participation;
- 38% on Access;
- 1% on Settlement

Collectively, these activities total 25.6 of 29.1 total hours recorded as merits time by DisabRA in 2011. The remaining 3.5 hours were not broken into the identified issues but were classified as “Case Management” or “Merits.” However, these limited hours that are not directly categorized do not meaningfully change the overall breakdown.

Once CforAT intervened as DisabRA’s successor in the fall of 2011, it spent the bulk of its time preparing testimony and working toward settling its issues of concern. In order to do so, it allocated its time as follows:

- 39% (17.4 of 44.9 hours) on Access (addressing substantive accessibility issues including preparation of testimony), not including 100% of Dmitri Belser’s time (6.25 hours) and 100% of expert Logan Hopper’s time (5 hours) also spent on Access;
- 41% (18.6 of 44.9 hours) on Settlement;
- 16% (7.2 of 44.9 hours) on General Participation;
- 4% (1.7 of 44.9 hours) on Implementation of the prior MOU.

In 2012: CforAT allocated its time as follows:

- 25% (2.9 of 11.5 hours) on Settlement (the settlement agreement was finalized and submitted via motion in February);
- 21% (2.4 of 11.5 hours) on Accessibility issues;
- 54% (6.2 of 11.5 hours) on General Participation, primarily monitoring the procedural progress of this complex proceeding.

In 2013: CforAT spent a very modest amount of time (3 hours) on general participation, namely following the procedural progress of this proceeding through the adoption of the PD as well as monitoring subsequent

substantive activity. CforAT also allocated one time entry (0.3 hours), reviewing the adoption of the MOU in the PD, as “Access.”	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2008	0.3	\$420	D.09-03-018	\$126.00	0.3	\$420	\$126.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2009	0.7	\$420	D.09-07-017	\$294.00	0.7	\$420	\$294.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2010	17.5	\$420	D.10-07-013	\$7,350.00	17.5	\$420	\$7,350.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (DisabRA)	2011	10.8	\$420	D.12-03-051	\$4,536.00	10.8	\$420	\$4,536.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2011	46.5	\$420	D.13-02-014	\$19,530.00	44.9	\$420	\$18,858.00 (1)
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2012	11.5	\$430	D.13-04-008	\$4,945.00	11.5	\$430	\$4,945.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2013	3.3	\$440	See comments below.	\$1,452.00	3.3	\$440 ⁴	\$1,452.00
Ron Elsberry	2008	3.8	\$400	D.09-03-018	\$1,520.00	3.8	\$400	\$1,520.00
Ron Elsberry	2009	3.0	\$420	D.09-10-025	\$1,260.00	3.0	\$420	\$1,260.00
Kara Janssen ⁵	2010	21.5	\$150	D.12-03-051	\$3,225.00	21.5	\$150	\$3,225.00
Kara Janssen	2011	16.2	\$160	D.12-03-051	\$2,592.00	16.2	\$160	\$2,592.00
Rebecca Williford	2011	0.3	\$160	D.12-07-017	\$48	0.3	\$160	\$48.00
Dmitri Belser (Expert)	2011	6.25	\$225	D.13-02-014	\$1,406.25	6.25	\$225	\$1,406.25

⁴ Approved in Decision (D.) 13-12-026.

⁵ Previously Kara Werner.

Logan Hopper (Expert)	2011	5.0	\$200	See comments below. Invoice attached with costs (but only included once in totals).	\$1,000.00	5.0	\$200	\$1,000.00
Subtotal:					\$49,284.25	Subtotal:		\$48,612.25
OTHER FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paralegal (DisabRA)	2011	1.8	\$110	D.12-06-012	\$198.00	1.8	\$110	\$198.00
Subtotal:					\$198	Subtotal:		\$198
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz (DisabRA)	2011	0.3	\$210	½ standard rate	\$63.00	0.3	\$210	\$63.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz (CforAT)	2011	1.6	\$210	½ standard rate	\$336.00	1.6	\$210	\$336.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2013	10.2	\$220	½ requested rate	\$2,244.00	10.2	\$220	\$2,244.00
Kara Janssen	2011	1.6	\$80	½ standard rate	\$128.00	1.6	\$80	\$128.00
Paralegal	2011	0.8	\$55	½ standard rate	\$44.00	0.8	\$55	\$44.00
Adjustment (2)								(\$281.50)
Subtotal:					\$2,815.00	Subtotal:		\$2,533.50
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Postage (DisabRA)	Mailing hard copies of service documents to ALJ and Assigned Commissioner.			\$4.06			\$4.06
	Telephone (DisabRA)	Long-distance telephone calls necessary for DisabRA's participation in this proceeding.			\$6.88			\$6.88
	Print/Copy (DisabRA)	In-house printing and copying costs for documents that were relevant to issues of concern for its constituency.			\$150.00			\$150.00

Expert Fees Logan Hopper	5.0 hours at \$200 per hour. Invoice attached, but compensation is addressed above as an expert fee.	\$0	\$0
Postage (CforAT)	Mailing hard copies of compensation request.	\$4.64	\$4.64
Subtotal:		\$165.58	\$165.58
TOTAL REQUEST \$:		\$52,462.83	TOTAL AWARD \$: \$51,509.43

*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

**Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁶	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Melissa Kasnitz	December 24, 1992	162679	No; please note from January 1, 1993 until January 25, 1995 and from January 1, 1996 until February 19, 1997 Kasnitz was an inactive member of the California State Bar.
Ronald (Ron) Elsberry	December 11, 1987	130880	No.
Kara Janssen	December 20, 2010	274762	No.
Rebecca Williford	June 2, 2010	269977	No.

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	DisabRA 2008 Merits Time
Attachment 3	DisabRA 2009 Merits Time
Attachment 4	DisabRA 2010 Merits Time
Attachment 5	DisabRA 2011 Merits Time
Attachment 6	CforAT 2011 Merits Time
Attachment 7	CforAT 2011 Belser Time
Attachment 8	CforAT 2012 Merits Time
Attachment 9	CforAT 2013 Merits Time

⁶ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

Attachment 10	DisabRA Comp Time
Attachment 11	CforAT Comp Time
Attachment 12	Hopper Invoice (2011)
Comment 1	<p>Justification for 2011 Rate for Expert Logan Hopper:</p> <p>CforAT/DisabRA are requesting compensation for expert fees for Hopper at \$200 per hour, the same rate that was requested for comparable work performed in A.10-11-015, Southern California Edison’s (SCE) 2012 GRC. Hopper has not previously had a rate set by the Commission.</p> <p>As set forth in the Compensation Request in the SCE proceeding, Hopper has been working in the field of architecture and physical accessibility for people with disabilities for over 30 years. His experience in the field was detailed in his testimony and includes substantial prior experience on the same issues for which his opinions were given in this proceeding. His hourly rate is routinely paid by clients of his consulting services, which have included PG&E and the Sempra Utilities. This rate is well within the ranges (\$155-\$390 per hour) set by the Commission for experts with any amount over 13 years of experience in Resolution ALJ-267.</p>
Comment 2	<p>Justification for 2013 Rate for Melissa W. Kasnitz:</p> <p>In D.13-04-008, the Commission adopted a 2012 rate of \$430 for Melissa Kasnitz. In Resolution ALJ-287, the Commission adopted a 2% cost of living adjustment (COLA) for intervenor rates for 2013. Applying the 2% COLA to Kasnitz’s 2012 rate, and rounding to the next even number, Kasnitz’s rate for 2013 should be set at \$440 per hour. CforAT has proposed this rate for 2013 in other compensation requests, but it has not yet been addressed by the Commission.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

#	Reason
(1)	According to Attachment 6 of CforAT’s intervenor compensation claim, only 44.9 hours were recorded for Kasnitz’s work for CforAT in 2011.
(2)	Due to the inaccuracies in the intervenor compensation claim, as noted in this decision, the compensation for the preparation of the intervenor compensation claim is reduced by 10%.
(3)	Resolution ALJ –267 sets 2011 rates for experts with 13-plus years of experience at \$155-\$390 per hour. Hopper’s advanced degree paired with his various work experiences qualifies him as an expert with 13-plus years of experience. As such, the Commission adopts the rate of \$200 per hour for work Hopper completed in 2011.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(2) and (c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Center for Accessible Technology's participation in this proceeding did not duplicate other parties' efforts.
2. The Center for Accessible Technology, and its predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates, have made a substantial contribution to Decision 13-05-010.
3. The requested hourly rates for the representatives of the Center for Accessible Technology and Disability Rights Advocates, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
4. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
5. The total of reasonable compensation is \$51,509.43.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Intervenor Compensation claim, as adjusted herein, satisfies all of the requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812.

ORDER**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Center for Accessible Technology is awarded \$51,509.43.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company (shall each pay half of the total award to the claimant, the Center for Accessible Technology). Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning September 28, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1305010		
Proceeding(s):	A1012005, A1012006		
Author:	ALJ Wong		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT), and its predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)	07/15/2013	\$52,462.83	\$51,509.43	No	Number of hours recorded in 2011 less than claimed. Reduction made for errors in intervenor compensation claim.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	DisabRA	\$420	2008	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	DisabRA	\$420	2009	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	DisabRA	\$420	2010	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	DisabRA	\$420	2011	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$420	2011	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$430	2012	\$430
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	CforAT	\$440	2013	\$440
Ron	Elsberry	Attorney	DisabRA	\$400	2008	\$400
Ron	Elsberry	Attorney	DisabRA	\$420	2009	\$420
Kara	Janssen ⁷	Attorney	DisabRA	\$150	2010	\$150
Kara	Janssen	Attorney	DisabRA	\$160	2011	\$160

⁷ Formerly known as Kara Werner.

Rebecca	Williford	Attorney	DisabRA	\$160	2011	\$160
Dmitri	Belser	Expert	CforAT	\$225	2011	\$225
Logan	Hopper	Expert	Consultant to CforAT	\$200	2011	\$200
		Paralegal	DisabRA	\$110	2011	\$110

(END OF APPENDIX)